

REMARKS

In the action of March 17, 2009, the examiner rejected claims 1 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112; rejected 1-2 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Kraals; rejected claims 1-2, 4 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Ramirez in view of Hardwood. The examiner objected to claims 9-11 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, and allowed claims 5-7 and 12-20.

In this amendment, applicant has amended claim 1 to remedy the rejection of that claim under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Withdrawal of that rejection is respectfully requested. Claim 4 has been amended to depend from claim 1 to correct the informality.

Applicant has also amended claim 1 to include the limitation of claim 9, which was indicated to contain allowable subject matter. Hence, claim 1 and those claims (4, 8) dependent thereon are now allowable.

Further, applicant has added new claim 21, which comprises previous claim 1, amended to remedy the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 and to include the limitation of claim 10 which was indicated to contain allowable subject matter. Accordingly, claim 21 is allowable, as is claim 11, which is dependent thereon.

In view of the above, allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any over payment to Deposit Account _____.

Respectfully submitted,

JENSEN & PUNTIGAM, P.S.

By Clark A. Puntigam
Clark A. Puntigam, #28,763
Attorney for Applicant